

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

Due notice has been given, the public hearing of the Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation for the Village of Southampton was held via video conferencing on Monday, January 24, 2022 at 7pm.

Board members Chair Jeffrey Brodlieb, Sarah Latham, Peter DeWitt, John Gregory and Mark McIntire are present

MOTION by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To open tonight's meeting.

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Counsel for the board, Alice Cooley is present.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To approve the minutes of January 10, 2022

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the matter of **Four Fountains LLC vs. Southampton Village Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation**, Index No. 618108/21: Resolution to authorize settlement, this has been duly posted and noticed, affidavits have been submitted to the file. There was a pre-submission conference on September 13, 2021. Melissa Dedovitch is here to represent the applicant. The parking entry court has been raised by two feet and the two steps have been removed leading up to the front door. The water feature has been removed and replaced with a planting bed. The front door has been recessed, a ramp has been added to the front parking court. The existing tree has been removed, and the hedge in the front has been changed to a solid hedge. Jennifer Gerakaris and Melissa Reavis are also here on behalf of the client. The plans being shared are dated November 5, 2021. Looking at the Ed Hollander landscape plan, a tree was removed in the front area and the hedge along the front entryway was made a solid hedge. The entry court now has cheek walls and it was raised by two feet. Ms. Latham would like to know the materials of the entry court and cheek walls. They will be stucco sided with a bluestone cap and the courtyard will be the the original bluestone pavers. The entry court was always the issue for Mr. DeWitt, he feels that this plan curbs that concern. He believes the ramp will, in time become covered in vegetation. The design is inventive. Mr. McIntire likes the recessed front door, he feels gives it a more residential look. Mr. Broadlieb agrees, previously it was . Mr. Gregory appreciates the changes made but he doesn't feel any of his previous concerns were addressed. He thinks it has an overwhelming presence. It's not the height, it's the rooflines and the overall design of the house. It is out of line with the rest of the neighborhood. Martha Reichert is here to represent the neighbors; a letter was submitted to the file on their behalf. She echos the sentiments expressed by Mr. Gregory. When the applications as denied in August, there was a concern with the massing and roofline and those concerns have not been addressed in this new plan. She would hope that the board holds the hearing open to see if the applicant would be amenable

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

to making change. Mark Picard is a neighbor to the property, he and the other neighbors have concern with the height and massing and how that will affect the neighborhood. The Village is looking at code changes to mitigate the issues they are bringing up and yet he feels that these same concerns aren't being considered by this board. Peter Pennoyer, architect points out that the raising of the court yard greatly impacts the scale of the house. Chair notes that the board does not succumb to the threat of legal action. Height is does not fall under the purview of this board, while massing does. This is a large house, but it is situated on a very large piece of property in an area that where there are other large houses on their large lots. Ms. Latham believes that a lot has been mitigated with the entrance facade. She is not of the opinion that the massing has been broken up, she does not feel that this is harmonious. Ms. Reichert requests a lighting plan, it was discussed with the prior application and would wish the board to consider that. There is an overall concern with sight lighting - landscape lighting, architectural lighting. There will not be excessive landscape lighting, they are only planning a lantern at the door. Ms. Devovitch notes that the landscape lighting has not been u under the purview of the ARB in the past, there is dark sky legislation in place and this will be compliant. Chair does not have great concern over the lighting, assuming that they will comply with the ordinance. There isn't excessive glass in this design. Mr. Hollander confirms that the landscaping lighting will be compliant with all Village restrictions. Mr. Picard notes there is a person in the rendering, the front door is above this persons head, this house will stand ten feet higher than anything else around it. He feels there is a need to see the lighting they are proposing to see how this will stand out. Gil Flanagan is the attorney for the applicant, he requests that the matter be closed for a vote. He does not feel that a lighting plan is necessary with the dark sky laws now in place in the Village. Ms. Latham noticed that there is no indication of lighting on the elevations at all - there are no sconces or lanterns shown. Mr. DeWitt notes that the architect is a famous designer of lanterns and he would not be concern with how they will look. Ms. Cooley advises that if they add lanterns or sconces they would need to come back before the board. Ms. Gerakaris concerns there are none proposed at this time.

The settlement agreement was read into the record.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adopt** the resolution as drafted by counsel for the settlement of **Four Fountains LLC vs. Village of Southampton BARHP**

On Vote: Chair, P. DeWitt, M. McIntire

Nay: S. Latham, J. Gregory

On the application of **Seersucker II, LLC**, 385 S. Main Street, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **approve** the application of **Seersucker II, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

On the application of **27 Gin Lane, LLC**, 27 Gin Lane, there is a written decision in the file.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **approve** the application of **27 Gin Lane, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **And By the Way Trust Subtrust A and And By the Way Trust Subtrust B**, the matter is adjourned

On the application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC**, 109 Hill Street, Robert Rocco and Steven Dubb are here to represent the applicant. Ms. Cooley would like to note that she has requested a copy of the original decision, this is forthcoming from the building department. Mr. Dubb shares photos taken Thursday, January 19th and Friday, January 20th, 2022 to demonstrate existing conditions. There was a question as to what was done in comparison to the prior ARB determination. A highlighted plan was shown indicated changes made. They have installed a walkway from the front of the house to the sidewalk, if the board is not amenable to that they can change it to sod. The pool fence detail would be 8x8 cedar posts with 1" square mesh to meet code. There is an outdoor kitchen area on the pool deck. The landscaping being proposed is fairly low. Mr. Gregory confirms that everything other than what is highlighted in yellow has been previously approved. A pedestrian gate was built at the front of the property, this was not previously approved by this board. Mr. Dubb can make changes to that if the board is not happy with it as is. Ms. Latham notes the amount of hardscape on the property is not in keeping with its history. A trellised gate that is not associated with a fence does not make sense to her. Mr. Gregory agrees, he doesn't know if he would still be opposed if there was a picket gate that connected. Mr. DeWitt agrees, he is concerned with the front steps, they are much wider than one would expect to see on a house of this vintage. They do not look like what was approved. The size of the pool deck is enormous in his opinion. Mr. McIntire echoes his board members concerns. Chair notes that there was so much effort made towards this application and preserving the historic aspects of this property. Great attention was paid to all of the details, he is disappointed with the disregard on behalf of the applicant. He would like to adjourn the matter to review the original files.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Beechwood Latch, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **BHNH, LLC**, 109 Hampton Road, this matter has been pending input by the building inspector. A memo was submitted to the file by building inspector, Tien Ho So. He has determined that there is an alternative plan to meet 2022 building codes without the addition of a dormer. John Bennett is here to represent the applicant. He is befuddled by the findings of the building inspector, he believes that specifics should have been provided. Mr. So stated that the stairs could have been moved 12 inches to the left, which is to the west side. There is a wall there, this would not be possible in Mr. Bennett's opinion. He tried to get clarification on the issue and was not able to. A board member suggested previously that the stair could be elongat-

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

ed, they will demonstrate how that will not work. Mr. Grew is here to demonstrate why these alternatives are not feasible. If the stair case is built in line with the temporary stair case, you do not have the necessary head height to meet code and it goes through a window. Moving the stairs to the west would run them through two bathrooms, they would also not meet NYS building code as it would require additional clearance between the front door and the landing. Their solution is reducing the height of the dormers by over a foot, they added an additional one to make it symmetrical and stepped it back to mitigate its impact. They cannot think of another reasonable alternative without losing bedrooms or bathrooms. Chair notes that their purview is the exterior of the house. The plans were submitted and approved by the building inspector did not show a dormer, they addressed this issue when the application first came before them. This board voted and approved the house without the dormers that they are now here arguing for. Mr. DeWitt shares an analysis that he has prepared based on the original plans submitted a year ago. The bathroom never fit under the stair to begin with. Mr. DeWitt suggests moving several walls to achieve additional room for the bathroom and achieve proper headroom for the stair. Mr. Grew disagrees, he feels this will negatively impact the upstairs bedroom. They've been down this road before, Ms. Latham notes that they voted no for a dormer originally because dormers do not belong on a greek revival home. Mr. McIntire feels this is an issue between the applicant and the building inspector. The board has reviewed this before and agrees with Sara, they addressed this during their original application. Mr. Bennett is of the opinion that they have demonstrated the historic regulations, regardless of where they come from, have to give way to the New York State Building Code. This is a health and safety concern. He thanks Mr. DeWitt for his analysis, they will review this.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **BHNH LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Fairlane Realty Corp**, the applicant is aware that the need to repost and notice the application. This will be removed from the agenda.

On the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC**, 40 Meadow Lane, Michael Sendlenski, Ted Fire, and Josh of ADP Architecture are here to represent the applicant. There was a site visit by some of the board members to see the lighting demonstration. The Chair had requested additional materials and the building inspector has requested elevations that included pyramid law drawn on. Mr. Sendlenski notes that the renderings cannot be provided in scale due to the angle they are drawn at. Looking at the north elevation, the two dormers have been moved. Josh feels that this is a minimal change, the zinc coated copper sidewalls will blend into the existing, really mitigating any impact the addition might have had. Chair notes this is still an addition to the dwelling. The south elevation will not change, all improvements are on the north side of the ridge. You will see the return of the zinc coated copper on the east elevation. On the west, where the elevator is proposed, they have balanced out the glass to create visual symmetry. The house will be coming out forward three feet, three inches. This was reduced to the original application. The dormers are setback fourteen inches. Mr. Gregory's concern is with the addition -

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

he feels it changes the massing and the size greatly. Mr. McIntire doesn't think he has much of an issue with it coming forward, most complaints received about this house is about the lighting. Mr. DeWitt thinks everybody should see the side by side lighting, he thinks this is an improvement. He believes this solves a complaint the community has had for some time. In this environment he does not think too much sky will be lost, he is fine with the addition. The architects have shown a lot of care and attention to the project. He is looking at the side elevations, and he wonders about the lighting from the sides. Instead of doing opaque glass he wonders why they don't use clapboard - that might provide the house with the residential air it currently lacks. Ms. Latham has visited the house during the day and at night for the light demonstration. She feels the dormers are setback from the limestone gable and they will not be visible come nightfall. Chair feels that the dormers take up a large portion of the roof line. This will increase the scale and massing in his opinion, especially from the street, across the street and the neighboring properties. Mr. Sendlenski clarifies that no written submissions have been made in connection with this application. The lighting has been reduced significantly. The lights shown on the plans are shielded lights, it is their intention to have a constant vernacular across the front of the property. They are proposing to remove 28 lights by pulling the house forward. Two windows are being proposed on the west side. They are being added to provide symmetry to the design. Chair is concerned with a third story glass walkway facing the neighboring property. Mr. McIntire wonders if the applicant would be amenable to not putting those windows in and adding a skylight. Josh explains it will be opaque glass and is just providing ambient light to the interior. While certainly a concession, the architect will discuss eliminating the windows with the client. Ted Fire, owners representative wonders if the only condition is ensuring that the windows on the west side does not emit any light through it, they can commit to that. Chair is concerned with the pyramid law still, the plans need to be reviewed by the building inspector. Materials are to be indicated on the plan.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Smithtown Partners, LLC**]

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Tates Bake Shop**, 43 North Sea Road, there is a request for an adjournment to February 14, 2022

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

There is a wrapped vehicle in the parking lot, Mr. McIntire would like this addressed by the building inspector.

On the application of **DCK Windham, LLC**, 35 Herrick Road, Larry Santana is here to represent the applicant. Affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. They are proposing louvered gates at a 45 degree angle that allows you to see through to the property. He also prepared alternative designs for the board to consider. This is a one piece, floating slide system, it is proposed eighteen feet off of the edge of pavement. It is fourteen feet long and six feet high. There is an existing solid gate that was constructed without approval, this will replace that.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

Mr. DeWitt thinks this design is a non-started; when looking at the property head on it inhibits the view of the property. Mr. Gregory thinks we need better drawings and material samples. Mr. McIntire feels that the angle of the pickets defeats the spirit of the 50% transparency request. Ms. Latham agrees. Chair feels it is a contemporary and stark gate proposed in a historic district. It is not in keeping with the neighborhood, nor does it meet the intent of transparency.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **adjourn** the application of **DCK Windham, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Paul Fagan**, 32 S. Main Street, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. He is proposing a similar gate as the previous application. He will talk with the applicant to redesign.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **Paul Fagan**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **31 Rosko Developer, LLC**, 31 Rosko Drive, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file as re-noticing was required. Haley Willis of the Adam Miller Group is here to represent the applicant. This is to amend prior approval from the ARB. Their goal is to facilitate an agreement between the applicant and the board. Ms. Willis has side by side elevation of what was previously approved vs. the current proposal. A list of changes has been submitted to the file with reasons for the requests. Some changes were made due to supply issues while other changes were made to become more harmonious with those needed changes. The elevations show nine over one windows, they are prepared to go back to the six over ones as originally approved. Chair feels that the applicant was well aware of the process needed to achieve approval for these changes yet he did not follow proper procedure. Mr. DeWitt feels they went from a well proportioned house, that may have been simplified but the new design is completely stripped. It went from a custom looking home to a spec house. The vertical teak siding gives a mid century look, the front door looks like a patio door and the columns have been eliminated to the point of insignificant. They do not carry any design presence. The window to wall ratio is awkward for Ms. Latham. It does look like, as Mr. DeWitt stated, a spec house. She is not in favor of the design; it is completely different than what they had approved. Mr. Gregory would like to see the windows as originally approved. He agrees with Ms. Latham, this is a completely different house than what was originally approved. The teak and the lack of presence the front door holds, are a cause for non start in Mr. McIntire's opinion. It also concerns him that the chimney is not in the same place; there have been interior modifications to this as well. Ms. Willis feels that simplicity for simplicity's sake is not a bad thing. It creates a streamlined design. She drove by the property and failed to see how it was not in keeping with the other houses in the neighborhood. Frank DeVito is the contractor on the job. He feels this is anything but a spec house, he is a custom builder. The vertical siding can be found throughout the neighborhood. When they were not able to find the supplies originally proposed, they went for upgrades. The new placement of the chimney was influenced by the existing condition of the house, same

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

with the placement of some of the windows. They needed to be adjusted due to the interior. Mr. DeWitt feels that the windows are too small. Mr. Devito notes the architect did not include the frieze board, the windows go up to them, he will request the drawings be amended. Ms. Latham notes there are a series of columns on the west elevation that are not connected to anything, this should be corrected. Fred Weinfurt is a neighbor to this property, he had expressed concerns in an e-mail when this proposal modification was first presented. There were also several letters submitted during the original hearings from the neighbors who expressed concern regarding the incompatibility of this house in the neighborhood. Mr. Weinfurt cannot think of another house in the area that has teak siding. He would hope that at minimum, the original cedar siding be replaced. He is happy to know that the windows are being changed back to six over ones. He believes that there are other elements that could change that would better the design, but he would defer to the board for that. His main concerns are the windows and siding. Mr. Devito would like to clarify that the window sizes did not change. The details the fascia and exterior trim stayed the same, it is only the removal of brackets that is being proposed. He will provide photos to the file of other houses in the area that use vertical siding, he feels it is more common than thought. Ms. Willis wonders if they can go through the list of changes that are acceptable to the board. The front door looks like a patio door, a front door is usually a solid door with sidelights, the vertical teak siding is not in keeping with the neighborhood, the windows need to be replaced, the wall of glass across the rear facade are all concerns of the board. The volume of the house, Mr. McIntire is fine with the removal of the pergola, he thinks the columns have gotten thinned down, the shape and material is fine but need to be more substantial. They need to have a rhythm in the design.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **31 Rosko Drive** to February 28, 2022

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Margaret Lewis**, there is a request for adjournment to February 14, 2022

Motion by Chair second by M McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Margaret Lewis**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Heady Creek, LLC**, there is nobody here to represent the application

On the application of **Kaveh Ansari**, 306 Hill Street, there is nobody here to represent the application

On the application of **Michael Munich and Anne Mahoney**, there is a request for an adjournment to February 14, 2022.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Michael Munich and Anne Mahoney**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

On the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**, 508 Wickapogue Road, Siyu Liu is here to represent the application. The plans shared are dated January 19, 2022. They have drastically reduced the amount of glass being proposed on the front and rear elevations. There were no changes made to the side elevations. Mr. DeWitt feels this is going to be a lantern on Wickapogue road. There is still too much glass in the center for Mr. McIntire and Chair. Chair especially does not see the need for all the glass on the front side of the house. The formality of the circular driveway was replaced by a courtyard - this did not mitigate the issue for him. This is an area where a few of the remaining farm houses in the Village are, this is the wrong house for this location in Mr. Gregory's eyes. Mr. DeWitt does not think this is not a design that needs to be tweaked, it needs to be revisited. Starting with agricultural buildings when designing this was the right idea in Ms. Latham's opinion, but the material should not be glass. That is where the design is missing the mark.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **adjourn** the application of **SKV Wickapogue Road, LLC**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Nicole Gallagher**, 145 Wickapogue Road, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted to the file. Mark Kaffaga and Mike Mangi are here to represent the applicant. They are proposing a cedar roof where there is asphalt currently, the rest of the work will be repairs to the existing structure. They were before the board a few years ago for the construction of the dwelling and were advised by the board not to allow the barn to collapse. They currently have it shored up. Mr. Mangi shared a photo of the condition of the barn, the window placements are the same. The rough openings are being matched according to Mr. Kaffaga. In the photo provided, it appears there is a hayloft opening, if that is the case it should remain one. Ms. Latham would just ask that the rough openings remain the same, the lanterns are a bit busy in her opinion. She would like to see the flavor of the barn retained. Mr. Gregory agrees, he would prefer to see a gooseneck. The design can be simplified. Ms. Latham would like to visit the site. Mr. Kaffaga states that they have retained some of the windows. Mr. McIntire will accompany Ms. Latham on a site visit. The building department will coordinate a meeting.

Motion by Chair second by M. McIntire

To **adjourn** the application of **Nicole Gallagher**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **Tamara Carmichael and Todd Grossman**, 93 David Whites Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting have been submitted to the file. This is an application for a large and pool house. Robert Fichette is here to represent the applicant, Steven Cinquemani with Jason Thomas Architects is also here. There is an application before the Zoning Board of Appeals, the only relief requested is for the swimming pool and not either of the proposed structures before this board. Mr. Fichette explains that the proposal is the demolish a non conforming garage and construct a conforming garage and pool house. The garage will be cedar shingle siding and roofing, the window trim is white Azek, the windows will be Marvin with simulated divided light. The pool house will match. This is a corner lot so everything is pushed away from

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

Pelletreau Street, there is an existing hedge that goes around the entire property. The neighborhood is scattered with accessory structures on or near the property lines. Mr. Fichette believes their proposal is in keeping with the area. Mr. DeWitt thinks it looks good, he has no issues with the proposal. Ms. Latham agrees, this is a handsome design. The plans are dated December 17, 2022.

Motion by Chair second by P. DeWitt

To **approve** the application of **Tamara Carmichael and Todd Grossman**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

On the application of **John Kuitward**, 102 White Street, Ramon Chavez is here to represent the applicant. At the last hearing the board was concerned with the overall size and transparency of the gate. They have redesigned and removed the solid panel that was previously proposed. There are no lights on the gate or posts. The material will be white Azek. Being this is not in the historic district, the board is comfortable with approving the material. Mr. Gregory likes the height and design. There will not be no gooseneck panel.

Motion by Chair second by J. Gregory

To **approve** the application of **John Kuitward**

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

There was a request for a presubmission review by the Board for 213 Windmill Lane. Alexander Pisa, property owner and Jorge Gomez the design consultant are here discuss the proposal. Chair prefaces the discussion with the fact that this is a presubmission conference this is not an official proposal. The current dwelling was constructed prior to 1952, the proposal for demolition needs to be sent to the demolition committee for approval. That process will need to happen prior to any approvals for a new design. Mr. Pisa wanted to get the board's feedback on the design before moving forward. This property is located within the office district, they are proposing a modern, two family dwelling. This being in the office district was the inspiration for a modern design. This is a private road off of Windmill Lane. He took inspiration from 1 Pond Lane, on the other side of Windmill Lane. It was constructed in 1951, what was interesting to Mr. Pisa was the low profile and curves on the building. In this district you can go up to thirty five feet by code, however he decided to stay low and horizontal. This particular design settles itself nicely on the site in the sense that the terrain behind the site and to the west rises, this allows it to sit nicely on the property in Mr. Pisa's opinion. He would also like to bring up to the board that he will maintain the two family status that he has on the property currently. It is in the heart of the Village, he recognizes the need for houses in the Village. Mr. Pisa has worked diligently with the Building Department and his designer to figure the details out as to how they will fit all of the requirements onto a smaller lot while blending it in with the current neighborhood. Chair notes that 1 Pond Lane represents a time when that was a commercial district populated with auto dealers and fueling stations. While this is in the office district, this still needs to be harmonious with the immediate area. This is an enclave that is vintage 1920s. This is a very different path for that area. Ms. Latham would like to point out right down the hill is a very beautiful and significant shingled building, the Sons of Gidian building. The context that needs to be explored.

Inc. Village of Southampton
Board of Architectural Review and Historic Preservation
January 24, 2022

Looking at the area provided, Mr. DeWitt notes that is surrounded by gables, this design is not in keeping with the neighborhood and inappropriate. Mr. McIntire believes the contrast between this design and the area is jarring.

Ms. Latham feels there are elements in the design that reminds her of Alto _____. She thinks that in another place, or made of wood the design would be okay. But it is not the right solution for here. Mr. Gregory thinks its a cool design, but agrees with his fellow board members, it is not in the right area. Mr. Pisa wonders if it is always a bad thing to have traditional style homes and a pop of modern? There is a house on the end of west prospect street there is a modern house, it works in this location because of the empty space that surrounds the property. This is dropping in a very contemporary design in the middle of a developed area. There is nothing wrong with a modern style in a Village setting, Mr. DeWitt just does not feel this does it successfully in this area. The Board would not be amenable to a modern design on this property. Chair would like to see a proposal that keeps the existing house. Modern elements can be added to the house successfully. Mr. Gomez finds it a little unfair that they are being asked to retain a gable roof and feels the board could be more open minded with this property. The has a parking lot, storage units and other commercial elements surrounding it. A submission to the demolition committee as well as to the planning board will be necessary for this proposal.

Motion by Chair second by S. Latham

To **close** the meeting of January 24, 2022

On Vote: Chair, S. Latham, P. DeWitt, J. Gregory, M. McIntire

Respectfully submitted by Jacqueline Allen 01/24/2022